

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 083 982

JC 730 278

AUTHOR Kintzer, Frederick C.
TITLE Professorial Involvement in Community Junior College Education.
INSTITUTION Florida Univ., Gainesville. Inst. of Higher Education.
PUB DATE Sep 73
NOTE 37p.

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; *Community Colleges; Counseling Services; Disadvantaged Groups; Educational Quality; Interinstitutional Cooperation; Junior Colleges; Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; Surveys; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Participation; *Universities
IDENTIFIERS UCLA; *University of California Los Angeles

ABSTRACT

An analysis of the relationships university faculty have had with community colleges is presented. It is pointed out that the attitudes and knowledge that university faculty possess often affect their actions relative to community college transfer students. At the 1965 meeting of the All-University Faculty Conference, the need for University leadership with respect to its lower division was left unmistakably clear. The potential of the University to strengthen its partnership with community colleges depends on the willingness of the faculty to participate. A survey was conducted to measure the present level of such a commitment of the UCLA faculty. Information was specifically sought with respect to individual involvement in community college education as student, teacher, administrator, parent of student, researcher, and consultant. Approximately 60 percent of the respondents to a questionnaire indicated some involvement with a community college or offered an opinion. Fifteen percent had attended a community college. Statements about community colleges included such comments as "smaller classed," "more individual attention," "better instruction," and "superior faculty." Areas in which the community college were rated include: services to students, academic preparation, counseling, disadvantaged students, and community colleges, university articulation. (CK)

ED 083982

JC 730 278

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT
OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

PROFESSORIAL INVOLVEMENT
IN COMMUNITY JUNIOR
COLLEGE EDUCATION

by

Frederick C. Kintzer

Institute of Higher Education
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida

September, 1973

PREFACE

Once in a while it becomes our privilege to note a research study carried out by a colleague in another university which merits particular attention. When this happens we feel it our duty to make the study available to others. With that in mind the Institute of Higher Education, University of Florida presents as a part of our special topic papers this study by Frederick C. Kintzer, University of California, Los Angeles.

Dr. Kintzer presents in this study an analysis of the relationships university faculty have had with community colleges. The attitudes, understandings and even basic knowledge that university faculty have often affects their decisions and their actions relative to community college transfer students. The problems of "articulation" may be multiplied by these attitudes.

While it is disappointing that such a small percentage of the questionnaires were returned, the information is revealing--There is need for more knowledge and basic understanding.

James L. Wattenbarger, Director
Institute of Higher Education

PROFESSORIAL INVOLVEMENT IN COMMUNITY

JUNIOR COLLEGE EDUCATION

Frederick C. Kintzer

Partnerships in higher education are crucial if the nation's collegiate institutions are going to meet the challenges of future decades. The need for cooperative planning, both statewide and interinstitutional, is urgent as colleges and universities struggle for survival under pressures of lagging enrollment and static budgets that are clear reflections of the lack of public confidence. Emphasis on accountability for learning has resulted, in part, from public demands for excellence as well as efficiency in the educational process. While a few educators resist these demands that threaten their security most professionals view such pressure as the challenge to improve systems of higher education in favor of students. Better avenues of communication and closer working relationships must be fostered if students are to be served according to individual need.

In recent years, the University of California Faculty Senate has expressed official support for improving university-junior college relations. The Seventh All-University Faculty Conference in 1952 was devoted to a full discussion of this subject. Again in 1965 the Twentieth Conference reviewed the relations of university upper division and junior college lower division curricula. While the need for better communication with high schools and junior colleges was repeatedly emphasized at these conferences, concrete suggestions aimed at such improvement were entirely lacking in the official reports.

Partners in Higher Education?

The university faculty, particularly in the views expressed in the report of the 1965 Conference, seemed primarily concerned with protecting the quality of its own lower division, and only secondarily interested in improving its relations with other schools in the state's public school system. Although a conference review committee admonished the University to concern itself with the education of junior college students, not a single resolution was presented to attempt to extend cooperative working relations with two-year colleges. The 1965 Conference merely reiterated the recommendation made at the 1952 Conference that "if the University is to operate its lower division as a pilot model, it would do well to consult junior colleges on relevant matters of mutual concern."¹ It was generally agreed by the 1965 Conference delegates that "University faculties are out of touch with what is going on in the public schools: they do not know and act as if they do not care."²

While no solutions were forthcoming from the All-University Faculty Conference, the need for University leadership was left unmistakably clear. Particular reference was made to the University's failure to provide opportunities for public school teachers and administrators to continue their education during the school year--a significant feature of a partnership in which the University should take the initiative.³

The importance of extending partnerships was again voiced during a national conference held on the UCLA campus July 6-8, 1972: "Community Junior Colleges and Universities: Partners in Higher Education." All three speakers appearing at the first session on "Perspectives in Community Junior College - University Relationships" urged the establishment of closer ties.

UCLA Chancellor Charles E. Young described the degree and rapidity of current change as being greater by many orders of magnitude than during any previous period, and suggested that unpreparedness or unwillingness to recognize the urgency to adapt to change will undoubtedly lead to institutional ineffectiveness and impotence. He called for development of cooperative programs among all three segments of California higher education, and particularly between universities and four-year colleges on the one hand and community colleges on the other.⁴

Speaking from the perspective of a community college president, Joseph W. Fordyce outlined the potentialities of partnerships in higher education by making specific references to the cooperative ventures currently sponsored by the St. Louis area Higher Education Coordinating Council. Committees, he indicated, are presently considering the mutual use of computers and educational television, reciprocal arrangements among libraries, and improvements in availability of collegiate opportunity.⁵

Representing both the interests of universities and community colleges, Thomas M. Shay, university professor, discussed ways in which the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges and the nation's senior colleges and universities can expand joint efforts to work together. He suggested that university professors should base research, leadership, training activities and degree programs on present and projected reality in community colleges. He called for a wide variety of cooperative programs and recommended that the Council and the Association should continually search for sound new ideas, regardless of their sources.⁶

In keynoting action report sessions, Stephen M. Epler described the decade of efforts at UCLA, through its Community College Leadership Program, to cement its ties with community colleges. He referred to the wide range

of two-year college-oriented programs established by the Leadership Program as spearheading a community college commitment--"a community college environment." He characterized the Program as an "expression of a healthy, dynamic, vital, and growing relationship between UCLA and the community college."⁷

The potential of the University to strengthen this partnership is directly related to the determination of its faculty to participate. The survey to be reported in this paper represents an attempt to measure the present level of such a commitment of the UCLA faculty. Information was specifically sought with respect to individual involvement in community college education as student, teacher, administrator, parent of student, researcher, and consultant. Several questions were included in the instrument to assess the effectiveness of community college education in preparing lower division students for UCLA, and in turn to assess the University faculty role in improving articulation with community colleges.

The response of the faculty was indeed gratifying not merely in terms of the number responding, but also in the deep concern shown by many members of the UCLA faculty for students and their welfare. Survey forms were sent to the 2,800 individuals included on the complete University mailing list and 587 were returned. Approximately 60 percent of the respondents (or 355) indicated some involvement with a community college or offered an opinion. Those participating represented a wide cross-section of the University colleges and schools and departments and specialties therein, as well as administrative divisions.

A number of respondents indicated by their answers that they were unaware of basic characteristics of the community college. One professor, although teaching a vocational course at a community college, apparently thought that a student attending the University of Southern California was attending a community college. Another said that he was teaching at a community college--Pepperdine College, a private four-year institution. Still another gave Idaho State College as the "community college" he had attended. A Los Angeles diagnostic school for neurologically handicapped children was thought to be a community college. The vast majority, however, appeared to be aware that the community college is a post-secondary institution recognized for the diversity of educational programs offered.

Community colleges in California are public two-year institutions governed by elected lay boards of trustees. They are recognized as low cost instruction-oriented colleges which have accepted responsibilities for offering some educational opportunities for almost everyone residing in the community. With only two generations behind them, they react rapidly to program requests and enjoy a personal rapport at home since most families have been involved there.

The genius of community colleges in California and elsewhere is the ability to provide on one campus--often a small compact one--opportunities for academic degree-bound students; opportunities for those who show interest in and aptitude for semi-professional and trade training; for high school graduates wishing to continue in general studies; and for adults in the local area who want cultural, recreational, and avocationally-oriented classes. Many who drop back after unsuccessful attempts in universities or need help in basic communication and computational skills also are served. Sizeable counseling staffs characterize student services units in these institutions.

By principle, community colleges attempt to serve every legitimate inquiry for help. Space, time, and financial considerations are their chief constraining factors.

Participation as Students

Fifteen percent (88 of 587) of the UCLA faculty responding to the survey had attended a community college. Thirty California and four non-California institutions were mentioned. Ten each had attended Los Angeles City College, Pasadena City College, and Santa Monica College. Since several had studied in more than one college, total ratings shown in the chart below exceeded the number of respondents who had attended community colleges. Most had been regular community college students. Only six reported their experiences as confined to adult education-type classes.

TABLE I
RATINGS OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE EXPERIENCE

Rated academic experience as:	<u>Letters and Sciences</u>	<u>Medicine, Dentistry, Public Health, etc.</u>	<u>All Other Schools</u>	<u>Total</u>
BETTER	6	7	7	(20)
ABOUT SAME	13	13	9	(35)
LESS ADEQUATE	7	9	6	(22)
UNEVEN: (Better to same)			3	(3)
UNEVEN: (Better to less adequate)	2		2	(4)
UNEVEN: (Same to less adequate)	1			(1)
NO RATING	—	2	1	(3)
	29	31	28	(88)

Well over two-thirds of those offering either positive or negative reactions to experiences as community college students rated the community college as good or better than the University. Twenty submitted statements favoring the community college.

"Smaller classes," "more individual attention," "better instruction," and "superior faculty" were most frequently cited. The last-named reaction--superior faculty--while not first in the ranking, was most elaborately and meaningfully explained. Supporting statements included on inquiry forms stressed the point that association with community college faculty was more direct and personal. Several recalled in the university student years having little or no direct contact with distinguished professors. One professor suggested that lower division courses at UCLA commonly handled by teaching assistants are viewed as low prestige chores by professors. Another remembered his community college instructors as more dynamic in their presentations and generally appearing to be interested in being more than mere information providers.

Actually, the number of positive and negative ratings were practically the same. Of the 22 negative statements, eight felt that community college instructors were less competent academically, five referred to lower academic standards and a like number mentioned less rigorous competition. Several likened the community college to upgraded high schools. One would expect university professors, of all groups of educators, to be the severest critics since academic excellence is their most important consideration. Almost two-thirds, however, rated their community college academic experiences as good as or better than their university experiences.

TABLE II
FORMER TEACHERS IN COMMUNITY COLLEGES

	<u>Respondents from Letters and Sciences</u>	<u>Respondents from Medicine, Dentistry, Nursing, Public Health, etc.</u>	<u>Respondents from All Other Schools</u>	<u>Total</u>
Full time	2	3	13	18
Part time	3	7	6	16
Student Teacher	0	2	1	<u>3</u>
				37

Members of the University faculty who had taught in a community college (37 of them) offered a wide variety of reactions, both positive and negative. Community college students were consistently characterized as less capable intellectually and generally less well prepared than University lower division students. They were remembered as being more responsive to didactic teaching techniques and expository materials. However, many respondents used such expressions as "very interested," "very responsive," "spontaneous" to describe their former community college students.

Characterizing community college students in general as less capable academically and less interested intellectually is supported by research. These and many other comparative factors are included in the SCOPE studies directed by Dr. Dale Tillery, University of California, Berkeley.⁸ SCOPE, an acronym for School to College: Opportunities for Post-secondary Education, is a longitudinal study which is now providing comparative data among noncollege, community college, and senior college (university) groups of students.

On academic aptitude, SCOPE research indicates clear differentiations. Measured on an academic aptitude test, 71 percent of high school seniors

enrolling in senior colleges scored in the highest one-third as compared with 36 percent of those entering two-year colleges, and 16 percent of non-college youth. Regarding intellectual interest, similar comparisons are found in the initial SCOPE data: comparative percents were for senior college entrants, 59 percent for community college enrollees, 36 percent and 23 percent for the non-college group. The SCOPE data further shows that broad samples of community college students self-rate themselves as having feelings of academic inferiority. On a "best ability" questionnaire submitted to SCOPE participants, those who later entered community colleges named working with tools and machines, painting and drawing, sports, and cooking and sewing. Senior college-bound students gave reading, mathematics, writing, music, conversation, and public speaking as their best abilities.⁹

This "characterization" clearly indicates that community colleges in general, deal with a different kind of student--a kind not consistent with the traditional mold. They are struggling to extend the potential of groups which Cross refers to as "America's newest college student."¹⁰ Community colleges are embracing tasks that differ both in kind and degree from those of the tradition-oriented university and should be applauded for accepting the challenge.

Success of students transferring from California's community colleges to the University of California is regularly demonstrated by data supplied by the University-wide Office of Educational Relations which indicates that at the point of University graduation grade point differences between groups of community college transfers and students who have spent their entire collegiate careers in the university are invariably insignificant.

While such success studies specifically related to UCLA have not been conducted in recent years, data from 1960-1964 groups are illustrative. A

group of approximately 1800 freshmen entering in 1960 was contrasted with some 800 students transferring in 1962 from California public junior colleges. Entering with a 2.85 grade point average, transfers, after one University semester dropped to 2.35. After three semesters, however, the group had improved to a 2.63 average.

Grade point differences between the two groups progressively diminish each succeeding semester-- .34, .26, and .15, respectively. While the study was not carried to graduation, it appears that the groups at that point would likely be separated by less than one tenth of a grade. It should be further noted that students ineligible because of inadequate high school grades are represented in the transfer group, giving added support to the quality of California public junior colleges in terms of success of its students at UCLA.¹¹

One is also reminded that in contrast to the "Open Door" admissions of community colleges the university is highly selective. While some highly qualified high school graduates choose to begin their collegiate careers in community colleges, many more who are eventually declared eligible to attend the university must first establish this eligibility. The future success of these individuals speaks well for the effectiveness of community college developmental programs that for many lead to ultimate success in the traditional university degree programs.

Several University colleagues recalled having more time in the community college to devote to teaching and working individually with students. Mention was made of small class advantages (which no longer, unfortunately, characterizes community colleges, especially those in urban areas), closer relationships with administrators, and, significantly, no pressure to publish. Some regretted the comparative lack of intellectual stimulation from students and academic peers.

One professor referred to an annual session at his former community college on "how to teach," and also to periodic evaluation of teaching through class visits of other faculty members. "The University (he remarked) could well make good use of these suggestions."

Former Administrators

In response to the Section V of the inquiry, participation in administration, four had been community college administrators. One commented that the major goals of his community college were clearly understood by the faculty. The same respondent, apparently having been responsible for an evening or adult education program, spoke of the difficulties in uniting a part-time extension-type faculty.

Parents of Community College Students

Forty-one respondents were parents of former community college students, many having sent more than one son or daughter to two-year colleges, for a total of 65 students. Five others reported a spouse as a student, bringing the total to 70. An associate professor in medicine had sent five sons to a community college. His observation was: "No pressure--some excellent teachers."

The quality of teaching was mentioned in a variety of expressions: "as good or better teachers," "satisfactory preparation to enter the University," "greater sense of community and belonging," "more personal identification with professors." A number of references were made to the community college's role as a "transition school" for "late bloomers." Several referred to the slower pace and lighter competition, the easier adjustment from high school and geographic convenience to illustrate this role.

A significant number felt that the community college was too much like high school. Most frequently noted failures were inadequate counseling and library resource limitations. A few apparently had experienced transfer difficulties as students.

A Minimum of Research on the Community College

If the response to Section VII of the survey inquiry is a reliable indicator, only a small amount of research on the community college is underway at UCLA. Twenty-one professors representing ten different schools and departments reported a comparatively small number of projects completed or underway. While most of these efforts were reported by members of the Graduate School of Education, primarily by professors in the higher education, administration, and counseling programs, the sampling of research mentioned outside this professional school did include a limited number of schools and departments.

Projects contributed by professors in the Graduate School of Education represented extensive efforts to identify philosophical bases, clarify functions, and initiate innovative practices related to community college education. Among specific projects reported were:

1. The extensive research efforts associated with the UCLA Junior College Leadership Program, particularly the series of 18 Occasional Reports on pertinent community college-oriented subjects;
2. The multi-activities of the Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, which comprises the most diversified research efforts found in any university;

3. The UCLA Danforth Program dedicated primarily to initiating cooperative research projects among groups of community colleges;
4. The Junior/Senior College Articulation Project dealing with systems of transfer, problems, and solutions;
5. The comprehensive research on bases for establishing a national data bank, termed "The Study of Junior Colleges;"
6. The UCLA Allied Health Professions Project which has already included task inventories and various publications on facility support services, clinical occupations and nursing occupations;
7. The UCLA Consumer Education Project which is committed to initiate consumer education programs in community colleges;
8. The University Program for the Admission of Minority Students (described elsewhere in this paper).

In addition to these, the Urban Educational Policy and Planning Program, a new field of specialization in the Graduate School of Education as well as a research program, is keyed to junior college education.

Another research effort described in some detail, Group Counseling of Minority and Low Income Junior College Women directed through a division of University Extension, involved more than 15 Southern California junior college counseling centers.

Other investigations were reported by professors in the Schools of Architecture and Urban Planning, Engineering, Law, Management, and Public Health; and the Departments of English, Theater Arts, Speech, and Botanical Sciences and Zoology.

Increased attention to the community college as a vital research area for University professor attention is indeed desirable. When one considers that the state's 95 community colleges transfer every fall a minimum of

1500 students into UCLA upper division, the importance of the community college influence on higher education in California is readily recognized.

Consultants in Community College Education

Ninety-three or fully one-fourth of the total responding group had served community colleges in some type of consultative role. The list of activities was extremely diversified. As would be expected, appearances as lecturer or speaker were most frequently mentioned. The involvement of professors in curriculum development, including actual course planning, represents one of the most potentially significant areas of service to community college education.

Projects developed by UCLA faculty were known to have been implemented in nine fields: Education, Engineering, History, Library Science, Mathematics, Music, Nursing, Dentistry (specifically, Oral Pathology) and Physical Education. Many more had served as consultants but had no idea if recommendations had been implemented. The professor-consultants obviously share in this communication failure.

The lack of follow-up communication is a weakness in the technology of professional consulting. Obviously, implementation of a consultant's recommendations does not occur automatically. If the consultant is to be a change agent, this vital stage must be anticipated and planned for in the proposal. While he is usually not in a position to direct the implementation of the recommendations, the consultant should exert indirect pressure on the institutional representatives to activate the techniques included in the design document and insist that he be apprised of decisions made as a result of the investigation.

Improving Services to Students - A Cooperative Effort

In Section IX of the survey, UCLA faculty members were asked to cite areas where community colleges might improve services to the transfer-bound students. Professors were also asked to assess the role that the University should play (particularly in special fields) to improve transfer from community colleges. A total of 128 colleagues submitted statements--occasionally lengthy statements. Two-thirds of these pertained to the University's role and many were critical of the University's inattention to transfer students. Reactions will be reported under five headings: Basic Academic Preparation, Counseling, Disadvantaged Students, Community College/University Articulation, and Communication.

Basic Academic Preparation

Some 50 professors offered comments pertaining to academic preparation in the community college. The majority of those observing pointed to weakness in the writing skills commonly noted in transfer students. This criticism was not confined to humanities and the social sciences where theme writing is ordinarily heavy, but included statements from respondents in art, chemistry, medicine, and public health, as well as management and law. This criticism is regularly substantiated in comments that former community college students exchange with their former counselors who come to visit them at the University. Community college counselors and admissions officers invariably report that transfers note the severity of competition for grades, and frequently associate this competition concern with the heavy writing requirements including a preponderance of essay-type examination questions at the University. In addition, they often refer to the great

amount of reading necessary in University courses. Transfer students also say that at the University they feel a greater independence and responsibility for their own educational progress. They confess that they miss the relatively close relationships with instructors, individualized teaching and the friendly informal atmosphere that characterized community colleges.

Seven professors including several engineers and members of the Physics, Psychology, and Sociology Departments noted deficiencies in basic mathematics.

Counseling

Counseling transfer students, while of critical importance, remains one of the weakest links in the relationship between community college and the University. Participants in the survey commented extensively on this deficiency. More than 80 observations, including suggestions as well as criticisms, were submitted. Most of the critical statements were directed at weaknesses in both University and community college counseling of transfer students.

In general criticism of the University, a Professor of English wrote:

Many of us recognize that the University does not do a good job of counseling. Our attitude is: 'if you can't stand the heat get out of the kitchen.'

Lack of attention given to transfer student orientation and continuing counseling is indeed one of UCLA's most glaring weaknesses. While special late summer orientation programs for incoming freshmen are well organized and effectively presented, similar advantages for community college transfer students are not provided. Orientation for a particular institution is not a community college responsibility. It is the University's. Correspondents representing Art, Chemistry, Education, English, Management, Nursing,

Political Science, Physical Education and Theater Arts, as well as several departments in the School of Medicine, all called for better communication in the counseling effort and coordination of curriculum. A strong plea was voiced for more counselors in professional schools. Counselors who would have primary responsibility for transfer students were requested.

A professor in the School of Architecture and Urban Planning calling for vastly improved guidance and counseling activities suggested the creation of a course or series of courses in the utilization of University resources designed for transfer students. This type of orientation is now being provided transfer students admitted to the Academic Advancement Program (see next section), but not for regularly qualified transfers. They too encounter similar environmental change difficulties which, regardless of previous academic achievement, are leading reasons given for leaving the University. To ease the difficulties associated with changing campuses, a music professor recommended that each incoming junior college transfer be assigned to a faculty member for at least one quarter for guidance and help. While the effectiveness of such a procedure would vary tremendously from professor to professor, the transfer student would be at the outset of his university career have a personal contact--a "home base"--where he could feel free to voice his problems.

This professor-student relationship is often practiced in private colleges and smaller universities, but unfortunately is seldom found where most needed--in large complex universities. Like others, UCLA is for most newcomers a great "ego-smasher." Steps should be taken to combat the tendency to reduce masses of students to numbers. There is ample evidence to confirm the complexity and seriousness of this situation.

To ease the transition and maximize student productivity, a professor of medicine suggested simultaneous registration in community college and university. A strong case could be presented for such an arrangement. Arguments similar to those used to support simultaneous high school-community college and high school-university enrollments are appropriate here. Why not concurrent community college-university attendance? Serious consideration should be given to flexible enrollments at this level as well. Rigid separation of community college lower division and University upper division is no longer valid. A pilot program allowing joint enrollments for selected community college students seems appropriate in recognition of the consistent success pattern of transfer students.

Several professors were critical of the quality of community college counseling. Particular references were made to inadequate academic advisement. A Theater Arts professor complained that many transfers seem to have been advised improperly and as a result have lost units. Three members of the School of Nursing mentioned community college advisement inadequacies. A professor in the School of Dentistry pointed out that community college students are sometimes allowed to take advanced courses before obtaining a solid knowledge of fundamentals. Despite the emphasis on counseling, it is clear that well-trained professionals as well as instructors interested in individual students are desperately needed in two-year colleges. Practically all California community colleges have comparatively large counseling staffs, but counselor-student ratios remain far too high. Current financial constraints have compelled some colleges to cut counseling staffs and limit types of counseling services.

Overprofessionalization of counseling staffs is another reason for the latter shift in emphasis. Concerns that students have for choosing the

right college or the right major may be too ordinary to be worth the high professional's time.¹² Academic advisements is indeed a vital counseling area that should not be taken lightly.

For the open-door college, strong guidance services are essential. Community colleges in California are legally required to admit practically everyone who requests it. Counselors particularly in urban community colleges face an enormously diversified student body which in a few short weeks every fall must be sorted according to talents, interests, and ambitions. Their ultimate success depends, in large part, on the quality of guidance and counseling programs and other student services provided.

Disadvantaged Students

A sizeable number of professors referred to the disadvantaged student in replying to question IX--"Other interests and impressions of community college education." Eighteen commented on the role of the University and the community college in serving the disadvantaged. Agreement was practically unanimous that these students would more than likely receive a better education at the two-year college. The community college, it was uniformly believed, would provide a more realistic chance to upgrade the performance of those determined to complete baccalaureate degrees. Better counseling, more attention to individualized instruction, and greater availability of appropriate audio and visual equipment were reasons cited to support this belief.

Several respondents regretted the University's present push toward what one termed "bootstrap educational programs." This sentiment was expressed in a variety of comments. The most detailed statement came from a psychology professor:

To throw such students directly into the more competitive atmosphere of the University is to deprive them of the chance to catch up at their own pace. I do not believe there is any magic in the University environment which can speed up this process beyond what otherwise might occur at the community college.

While it was generally felt that education of most disadvantaged students was a major mission of the community college, the University was urged to cooperate. One suggestion was to develop "intermediate cooperative programs" on both campus. The University was further urged to initiate special counseling and tutoring programs for community college transfers classified as disadvantaged.

Such programs have actually been available at UCLA in abbreviated form for several years. In 1968 under the so-called High Potential Program, 50 black and 50 chicano high school graduates were admitted to the University. Supporting services, to a limited extent, were also introduced.

The work of the current Undergraduate Recruitment and Development Office represents a considerable expansion of the original High Potential Program. In 1972-73, approximately 2000 undergraduates were admitted by this office, a majority of them by special action. About 800 had apparently had some experience in a California two-year college.

Two University offices coordinate services for these students--the Academic Advancement Program and the URD Counseling Center.

The Counseling Center created to serve URD students has as its primary objective to provide the type and quality of services that would increase the probability of successful degree completion. The Center offers personal counseling and tutoring for University courses. Upper division and graduate students are hired as individual and group tutors. Tutoring groups called "back-up discussion sessions" are organized for courses in which several of the URD students are enrolled.

Specialized instruction is provided by the Academic Advancement Program. All URD-admitted students are required to take a course entitled: "Dynamics of University Adjustment," and those who did not meet University academic requirements are provided specialized instruction and assistance through the AAP. Two academic skills courses were offered in the 1972 fall quarter--one to prepare for English Subject A and the other to improve mathematical computation to the level of Mathematics I or IIa.

Monitoring the academic progress of URD students is a major responsibility of the URD Counseling Center. The importance of this charge can hardly be overestimated if those admitted with substandard achievement are going to have a fair chance of eventual survival in regular University courses.

Another organization has been actively engaged for several years in increasing the flow of minorities to UCLA--a consortium of four community colleges (Compton, East Los Angeles College, Los Angeles City College, and Pasadena City College) and UCLA. The Southern California College Consortium has recently launched a special services project funded by the U. S. Office of Education to provide special counseling, tutoring, developmental classes for students selected by the community colleges and admitted to the University. The initial group composed of 249 students (54 from Compton, 57 from East Los Angeles, 67 from Los Angeles City, and 65 from Pasadena City College) were admitted fall quarter 1971 and integrated with others in the URD/AAP organization. The vast majority (over 95 percent) entered as sophomores or juniors. An additional 300 Consortium students were admitted to the UCLA special services project for the fall of 1972.

A first year progress report prepared by the Director of Evaluation and Program Studies and released in November 1972, presents a detailed description of the first Consortium group and a comparative analysis of the academic performance of 242 of the original 249 students that includes efforts to isolate specific factors such as income, parental education, use of the special preparatory class in English and mathematics that affected academic success.¹³

Of the 242 students included in the analysis, 210 were admitted by special action, 32 were qualified under regular admission criteria. At the conclusion of the initial year, 114 were in satisfactory academic standing, 128 of the 242 were on probation subject to dismissal or had left UCLA.

Although the experimental program experienced heavy attrition during the initial year, a sizeable number of students continued into a second year in good standing. Few, if any, of them would have otherwise had the opportunity to enter UCLA.

Steps have already been taken to attempt to control the heavy attrition that characterized the first Consortium group. Most of the transfer students admitted under the program for fall 1973 will be regularly admissible. Records of those few admitted below standards will vary in units completed rather than in grade point average.

University admission of high school ineligible transfer students (those graduating from high school without "B" averages) has been recently liberalized. Beginning fall 1973 on an experimental basis, advanced standing students will be accepted with a minimum 2.0 grade point average instead of the current 2.4. Minimum level standards of Consortium students will be kept, however, at the 2.4 level. University representatives in the Consortium organization will also be much more active in the selection process, itself.

Economic rather than academic disadvantage has apparently become the primary emphasis in selecting students for the Consortium.

The Consortium is also attempting more effective means of involving students in recruitment, counseling, and academic programs, and to increase the development of research in socio-educational problem areas relative to ethnic and low income students. Increasing cooperation among Consortium members in the total program is evidenced in an Institute on Urban Education developed and presented by Pasadena City College and a counselors' workshop offered at Compton College for counselors representing the University College of Letters and Science, URD office and Compton.

Community College-University Articulation

Community college-University articulation, the relationship that centers on the process of transfer, was a popular topic among those who answered question IX. Forty-six offered ideas about this transfer relationship. Several chided the community colleges for not changing as quickly as "higher education," not preparing students for University work, or not seeking out the University for help in curriculum preparation.

Others felt that the University was more at fault for creating and prolonging transfer difficulties. Two of the specific charges were: (1) changing course patterns without advance communication with community colleges; and (2) continuing such widely divergent major requirements among departments, schools, and colleges as to make transfer, at least for some, an impossibility except for only the largest and most diversified community colleges.

Curriculum dynamics requires constant two-way communication. As one professor stated: "Many more obstacles originate from consideration of educational politics than from consideration of educational values."

Attention is again called to the Articulation Conference: the vehicle with an impressive success record in promoting communication among institutions in California education--both public and private.

Representatives of ten departments suggested elimination of freshman and sophomore years at the University; thus forcing all lower division work into the community colleges and the state university and college system and freeing the University to emphasize upper division and graduate education, primarily the latter.

This suggestion is certainly not a new one. One of the early attempts to "amputate" the "lower division legs" of a university was made by David Starr Jordan, who in 1907-08 as President of Stanford University, advocated in reports to the Board of Trustees the elimination of the lower division. He further requested that after August 1, 1910 entrance requirements include 60 units of collegiate work culminating in the Associate of Arts degree from a junior college. The Board took no action on these recommendations.

The clearest statement advocating the elimination of university lower division was made in 1900 by William Rainey Harper when, as President of the University of Chicago, he presented to the faculty a formal statement on the removal of the first two years of the University in favor of a "junior college"--for "lack of a better term." He said that such "chopping off" could result in several specific benefits. Less capable students, for example, could "terminate honorably" and universities could become "honest institutions."

While upper division graduate universities have not been attempted in California this type of institution in public higher education is now found

in at least seven states. Best exemplified in Florida upper division graduate universities are most highly developed in Florida where these institutions are in close communication with the community colleges. Success of these institutions is generally attributable to their willingness to respect the integrity of the two-year colleges.

Upper-level university/community college articulation is not problem free. Although the basic university structure simplifies the process and eases the spirit of articulation, similar issues plague this relationship. Community college students must take the right courses to assure equal opportunity for success in upper division work.

The University of California has consistently supported the junior college movement, readily accepting, after the fledgling years, credits earned in courses approximating the University's own offerings. In the early years (c. 1910-1930) the University understandably enforced a rigid transfer policy of exact course parallelism, and for several years maintained a watchful eye on the new high school-related institutions through an "affiliate" relationship. For a short period lasting only from 1923-1926, eight junior colleges were in effect University extension centers with teachers selected by the President and courses approved by the University faculty.

Following the dissolution of the "affiliate system" in 1926, more flexible transfer relationships were rapidly instituted. The shift from exact course to similar or equivalent course policies was signaled in an address given in 1930 at the annual meeting of the National Association of Junior Colleges by University of California President Robert Gordon Sproul. President Sproul referred to the next decade as an opportunity for junior colleges to place a premium on initiative and variation rather than on

conformity. To follow the old lines, he commented, would not be sufficient. Thus began a new era in the University of flexibility in accepting community college credits and courses and an increasing cordiality in the general relationship.

The success of transfer students in the University has been an important factor in strengthening the acceptance of community college transfer programs. At the present time, community colleges identify transfer courses that are annually checked and invariably endorsed by the University-wide Director of Admissions and Registrar. From the community college perspective, however, the ultimate position yet to be accomplished is the full acceptance of the associate degrees, including technical-vocational work and without regard to the high school record.

The associate degree in California's two-year colleges, and in other states where vocational-technical education is heavily emphasized in community colleges, does not necessarily prepare students for a traditional baccalaureate degree. The associate degree, as laudable as it is in its own right, may have little to do with lower division preparation provided the university student. As the pendulum swings toward greater two-year college authority to name and authorize lower division transfer courses, we must remember that the baccalaureate degree is still granted by the senior institution.

Communication

Many of the 128 colleagues responding to the ninth section of the survey referred to weaknesses in University-community college communication systems. Few made suggestions.

Heaviest criticism of the University came from the School of Engineering and Applied Science where it was generally felt that decisions to change curriculum had in the past been made far too frequently by the University without sufficient communication with community college engineering departments and deans of instruction. One professor felt quite strongly that the junior year curriculum should be left untouched. "After all (he concluded) it is not difficult to make required changes by simply changing the content of individual courses." Several other correspondents from that school appeared to agree that the University should work more closely with community college people in developing and updating courses. "We should consider more heavily what's going on in community colleges," was the general reaction.

Despite the fact that many concentrated on the need for better communication with the community college, only two colleagues mentioned the state organization called the Articulation Conference. Actually created under the general guidance and urging of the University some 40 years ago, this organization was created to deal directly with specific transfer problems. It consists of nine representatives of California's public secondary schools, state universities and colleges, private universities and colleges and the University of California, 11 representatives of public community colleges, four members representing the State Department of Education and one each from the Coordinating Council for Higher Education and the California Elementary School Administrators' Association. The four segments of public education and representatives of private higher education, each a Committee on Articulation, meet annually in the fall to consider areas of concern and specific problems, and to prepare for the spring meeting of the total Articulation Conference as a regular feature of this annual

meeting, the segmental groups meet individually and in turn with other segments. The great strength of this organization is that it is responsive to consensus agreement not of edict--action through influence rather than by force. This commitment is specifically stated as a main purpose: "To bring about better understanding among the segments (rather than) to impose the will of one upon the other."¹⁴

The working groups of the statewide organization are the liaison committees. Usually organized as subject matter units, these committees meet during the year to work out transfer details and solve individual grievances. The Engineering Liaison Committee is probably the most influential of the conference's standing committees. It is not uncommon to find 100 people or more in attendance. It is through this action-oriented committee that the UCLA School of Engineering and Applied Science has its best opportunity to improve articulation. Sudden unilateral action must be avoided at all costs if smooth transfer is to be facilitated.

Several applauded the work of the Office of Relations with Schools. Formerly associated with the University-wide administrative and service organization called Educational Relations, this unit now decentralized is directly attached to the UCLA Vice-Chancellor's Office of Academic Programs. Under the new title Office of Recruitment and Institutional Relations it is committed to many of the programs developed by its predecessor. Particular mention was made of the conferences sponsored annually for high school and community college counselors. These well-attended events held separately in the fall both in southern and northern California provide general information on University-wide admissions and on requirements of the various University colleges, schools, and departments.

Praise was also given to the extensive visiting program initiated decades ago by the Office of Relations with Schools. Although the focus of the current organization is necessarily on recruitment, its officers continue to work most closely with community college counselors.

Reference should also be made to publications continued by the University-wide organization. Two in particular: "California Notes," a monthly newsletter to schools and colleges, carries a wide variety of releases from the several campuses. The "Prerequisites Bulletin" issued in February is a diversified publication providing basic orientation to the University--its curricula and services in great detail.

Do Many Care?

In the final section of the survey, impressions of community college education were requested. Ninety-six colleagues from 32 disciplines submitted statements which in total touched all major responsibilities associated with two-year college education. Two-thirds of the responses were favorable. Those who reported having visited, attended, or worked in a community college were invariably complimentary. Those who reacted negatively frequently compared the two-year college to high school experience. Although several wrote lengthy statements related to improving University/community college relationships, only a few provided specific suggestions. As reported in the proceedings of the 1965 "University Conference on Undergraduate Education and Its Relation to High School and Junior College," a majority of University professors remain out of touch with community college education; only a few act as if they knew or cared.

What Can the University Contribute?

What should the University be doing to establish closer ties with community colleges? What steps could be taken to effect the partnership idea? How can individual professors most effectively serve the community college movement?

Academic divisions and service units of the University are presently engaged in a variety of cooperative activities with two-year colleges. Several of these have been discussed in connection with the community college consortia, the work of the University-wide Office of Relations with Schools, the UCLA Undergraduate Recruitment and Development Office and Counseling Center, the UCLA Community College Leadership Program, and the University's role in the California Articulation Conference. Of these activities, the latter has the strongest potential for assuring a lasting partnership in the total perspective of higher education. The University can ill afford to abdicate its leadership role in this organization which is committed to the partnership concept.

Representatives of several departments described activities held at UCLA involving community college guests. The Department of Chemistry annually invites representatives of community college chemistry departments to the campus for the purpose of coordinating chemistry curricula, particularly lower division. The School of Engineering and Applied Science holds a similar meeting primarily for community college counselors specializing in engineering transfer programs. A cooperative program developed by the Department of English was also reported. Community college English teachers are regularly employed in the department to establish a bridge between the UCLA department and various community colleges. A

visiting lecturer on leave from Pierce College for the 1971-72 year helped to establish a program for M.A.'s who plan to teach in community colleges. She also served during the year at UCLA in a liaison capacity with surrounding community colleges.

Such activities should be considerably expanded. Professor motivation to provide this leadership (to take research time for this) is tied to the University reward system.

In the area of community college research, the University record is unfortunately weak. Most research efforts, as indicated in an earlier section, are currently confined to the Graduate School of Education. While these activities should be described as fundamental and comprehensive, other efforts throughout the University generally are scattered and limited. The potential of well organized and coordinated research on community college education is almost limitless.

Perhaps the most striking need for research lies in a redefinition of philosophical concepts. Because of its determination to be all things to all people, the community college continues in an identity crisis. Research is urgently needed to interrelate its diversified responsibilities to relate these declared functions to similar efforts in other institutional types.

Far too little is known about students beyond biographical information, academic interests and abilities, and other obvious identifying information. Information is also lacking on the work profiles of college communities and other environmental elements.¹⁵ Here are vast areas of investigation where community college and University personnel might develop cooperative programs of applied research.

Community Services or Continuing Education is one such field where each of the several units of public education in California is involved. In this regard, research now actually underway in the Graduate School of Education would attempt to determine the roles of University Extension, the community college, the public high school and other local, regional, and state agencies in Community Services. Other areas in which concern is felt for cooperative university-community college study include:

1. Fiscal and financial planning
2. Educational accountability
3. Collective bargaining
4. Styles of governance and administration

An administrative organization is, in fact, available to be utilized in extending such cooperative activities--the Advisory Council of Presidents for the UCLA Community College Leadership Program. Led by the Council's executive body of ten elected presidents, this unit meets regularly to plan programs of a cooperative nature. Several references have been made to this organization with respect to its potential leadership values.

This University, as identified officially in the Proceedings of the Twentieth All-University Faculty Conference (1965), should be more directly concerned with teacher (and administrator) training. Questions raised during the 1965 Conference continue to be raised, and appropriately so: What opportunities does the University offer teachers to continue their education during the year? How many classes in upper division English, languages, mathematics, history, etc., are given late in the afternoon or evenings, the only suitable hours? What courses actually emphasize the content that a teacher needs?

Comments offered in the 1965 Proceedings on University promotion patterns pertain to those professors specialized in teacher and administrator training. These professors continue to run the risk of being down graded even sneered at by their colleagues. At promotion time, their concern with teacher preparation may do them more harm than good.¹⁶

Obviously, the University academic divisions responsible for community college teachers and administrator preparation should not automatically continue present training styles. Research is needed to adapt such programs to the schools of tomorrow. Incentives to develop new approaches are directly tied to University promotion patterns. Professors who suspect that efforts toward such research and planning might slow promotion applications would ordinarily not devote full energies to improving teacher and administrator preparation programs.

In view of the present plateauing of community college enrollment and a plethora of traditionally trained Ph.D.'s, attention should be focused on the development of in-service programs for community college personnel. For similar reasons, and others, the time is right for a thorough review of advanced degree programs, including both the Ph.D. and Ed.D. This critical examination is now in progress in the Graduate School of Education. Potentialities of new degree concepts are being studied.

FOOTNOTES

1. University of California. Relationship of the Upper Division to the Lower Division and the Junior Colleges. Proceedings of the Seventh All-University Faculty Conference, May, 1952, p. 19.
2. University of California. Undergraduate Education and Its Relation to High School and Junior College, Proceedings of the Twentieth All-University Faculty Conference, April, 1965, p. 28.
3. Ibid., p. 29.
4. Charles E. Young. "Community Junior College--University Relationships: Perspectives from a University Chancellor's Office." Community Junior Colleges and Universities: Partners in Higher Education, (Frederick C. Kintzer, Ed.) Occasional Report No. 18, Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, 1973.
5. Joseph W. Fordyce. "Community Junior College-University Relationships: Perspectives from a Community Junior College President's Office." (Frederick C. Kintzer, Ed.) Occasional Report No. 18, Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, 1973.
6. Thomas M. Shay. "The Working Relationships of AACSC and the Council of Universities and Colleges: Some Proposals for a Council Position Paper." (Frederick C. Kintzer, Ed.) Occasional Report No. 18, Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, 1973.
7. Stephen M. Epler. "Community Junior Colleges and UCLA: A Twelve-Year Case Study." (Frederick C. Kintzer, Ed.) Occasional Report No. 18, Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, 1973.

8. Dale Tillery, et al. SCOPE Four-State Profiles, Grade Twelve, 1966, California, Illinois, Massachusetts, North Carolina, the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education and College Entrance Examination Board, New York, 1966.

9. Patricia H. Cross. "Higher Education's Newest Student." (in Student Development Programs in the Community Junior College, Terry O'Banion and Alice Thurston, Eds.) 1972, pp. 31-33.

10. Ibid., p. 33.

11. Frederick C. Kintzer. "Profile of an Ideal Community College." College and University, Vol. 32, Summer 1967, p. 472.

12. Jane E. Matson. "Student Personnel Work Four Years Later: The Carnegie Study and Its Impact." Student Development Programs in the Community Junior College (O'Banion and Thurston, Eds.), Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972, p. 174.

13. Susan Meives. The Southern California College Consortium 1971-72: A First Year Progress Report, Office of the Vice-Chancellor, Academic Programs, UCLA, 1972.

14. Minutes: Spring, 1966 Articulation Conference. University of California, University Dean of Educational Relations, Relations with Schools, Los Angeles, p. 34.

15. Matson, op cit., p. 179.

16. University of California. Proceedings of the Twentieth All-University Faculty Conference, op cit., p. 28-29.